



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,733	02/27/2001	Petra Loos	02481.1726	9899

22852 7590 10/22/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
1300 I STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

SIEFKE, SAMUEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/763,733

Applicant(s)

LOOS, PETRA

Examiner

Samuel P Siefke

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 8/11/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument "Mehta et al. does not disclose or suggest use of a handle." The chuck 40 is connected to a drive shaft 12 (col. 4, lines 43-55), which can be used to carry the connected mesh basket. Handle, defined by Webster Dictionary, is a part that is designed especially to be grasped by the hand. Shaft 12 is in a cylindrical form that would be able to be grasped by a hand, therefore being structurally capable of performing the function of a handle. Applicant argues, "the outer shaft 12 is rotating during use, it follows that it is not "designed especially" to be grasped by the hand as it would rotate in the holder's grasp, and therefore, it cannot be grasped by a hand." When the shaft is not rotating "sample not be analyzed" the shaft would not be rotating. Therefore one would be able to use it as a handle, as argued above. Applicant argues "Mehta is completely silent as to the use of a handle on the lid of its apparatus, and the figures do not disclose or suggest the use of a handle." The drive shaft 12 "handle" is structurally attached on top of the lid. Therefore it is on the lid. Applicant argues "the Examiner is incorrect in his assertion that the basket of Mehta may be used with a paddle agitator, continuous flow cell, and rotating basket apparatus." Claim 8 recites the testing apparatus being at least one of a paddle agitator, a continuous flow cell, and a rotating basket apparatus. Mehta discloses all three of these limitations. Paddle agitator is disclosed on col. 4, lines 55-61. A continuous flow cell is produced when the dosage unit is subjected to a flow of solvent extending over substantially all of its

Art Unit: 1743

exterior surfaces (col. 3, lines 66-col.4 ,line 2), and lastly the rotating basket apparatus.

This is the primary use of Mehta, a basket that rotates in a solvent.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims **8-17,19** and **21-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mehta et al. (USPN 4,856,909).

Mehta discloses a pharmacological dissolution apparatus that comprises:

- a mesh basket configured to receive a material to be tested (fig 2,4, ref. 18; col. 4, lines 65-27);
- a lid (fig. 4, ref. 40) including a handle (fig. 2, ref. 12) on one side of the lid;
- the lid (40) includes at least one fixing clip (fig 6, ref. 30) on a side of the lid opposite the handle (looking at fig 6, the top of the handle is where ref. 60 is and the on the opposite side of the top of the handle are the clips);
- the basket is cylindrical in shape and includes an open end and a closed end (fig 2,4, ref. 18; col. 4, lines 65-27);
- the basket includes a narrow metal band around at least an open end of the basket (fig. 6, ref. 26 or 27, col. 4, lines 66-67);

Art Unit: 1743

- the handle includes a bracket configured to allow removal of the device from the testing apparatus (the handle is the bracket; as discussed in specification of the current application on page 5, lines 32-34);
- the device is configured to fit within a paddle agitator, rotating basket apparatus or a continuous flow cell (col. 1, line 48- col.2, line 41);
- the material to be tested is medicament in solid form (col. 1, line 6- col.2, line 41);
- the lid is a plate (fig. 4, ref. 40);
- the fixing clip is configured to connect the lid to the basket (fig. 6 and fig 2);
- the lid includes three fixing clips (fig 5, ref. 30, 30 and 30);
- the handle includes a rod (fig. 2, ref. 14, or the rod can be handle 12);
- the mesh forming the basket is a wire screen fabric (fig 2,4, ref. 18; col. 4, lines 65-27).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim **18** and **20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehta et al. (USPN 4,856,909).

Mehta discloses a wire mesh basket discussed above.

Mehta does not teach the lid of the basket be made of mesh.

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art to modify Mehta to have a lid that is mesh in order to maximize fluid flowing through the basket.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1743

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel P Siefke whose telephone number is 703-306-0093. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 703-308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

SPS  
October 19, 2003



  
Jill Warden  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700